

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date:

Concept Statement

Description

Brief description of the proposed project:

Provide agency and public access to Wetland Tracker (WT), a web-based, public access portal to information about the distribution, abundance, and condition of all wetlands in California, including wetland projects. It is designed as a one-stop source of information about the ecological health and permit status of individual wetlands and projects. It is designed for application through the State's proposed Regional Environmental Data Centers as part of the enterprised State Wetland Portal. With respect to the State's IT Strategy, WT at least advances objectives 1-5 of Goal 1, objectives 2, 3 of Goal 2, objectives 1, 2, 6 of Goal 4, objective 2 of Goal 5, and objective 3 of Goal 6.

Need Statement

High Level Capabilities Needed:

Currently aquatic resources are regulated by six state and federal agencies. No common platform exists for integrating mapping and condition data across all programs. The State's Wetland Conservation Policy (EO W-59-93), its USCWA 401 and Porter Cologne WDR programs, and meeting State's reporting requirements under USCWA 305b requires ongoing accounting of the acreage and condition of wetlands throughout the State. Meeting these tracking and reporting needs requires mapping wetlands and related projects, assessing their condition relative to ambient condition, and making the results publically accessible in management-relative timescales.

What is Driving This Need?

There is no statewide capacity to know where the wetlands and related projects are, or how they are doing. The State Water Board was directed by the Legislature in 2002 to take necessary additional steps to protect and conserve wetlands. A State Water Board study (Ambrose, Callaway, & Lee, 2006) found that it was ineffective in tracking permits and insuring compliance. SB 1070 (Kehoe Water Quality Information, 2005) requires the State Water Board to implement a public information program on water quality matters and to maintain a web site for data related to water quality monitoring, permitting and enforcement.

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date:

Concept Statement

Risk to the Organization if This Work is Not Done:

The primary risk is that the intrinsic values of wetlands and their essential services to people will not be protected despite the public's continuing large investment in their protection through State policies, programs, and projects. The decline in wetland quality and quantity, while not quantified, will be self-evident. As a result, the public's will to protect wetlands and its trust in government will also decline. Federal support for State wetland programs and other environmental protection efforts will be decreased.

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: _____

Concept Statement

Benefit Statement

Intangible Benefits

Process Improvements (describe the nature of the process improvement):

Wetland Tracker (WT) will streamline and standardize wetland permitting under the State's 401/WDR Program, while providing the first-ever process to track these permits within regions of the State and statewide. WT will also enable the State to efficiently and accurately report on the status of its wetlands as required under USCWA 305b. It will improve agency regulatory capacity by consolidating data management activities. It will provide state and local agencies with a planning tool to prioritize development and conservation areas.

Other Intangible Benefits:

WT has proven to increase the public interest and understanding of wetlands and related issues. The public library feature of WT enables interested people and organizations to communicate about wetlands through map-based data and information uploads and exchanges. WT can greatly benefit wetland and watershed planning and management by providing the only comprehensive picture of the distribution of all existing and proposed wetland projects and related opportunities.

Tangible Benefits

Revenue Generation (describe how revenue will be generated):

WT development monies will continue to come from federal and State grants and contracts. Annual OM cost estimates range from \$40k to \$100k per region of the SWRCB. The Wetland Monitoring Workgroup of the State's Water Quality Monitoring Council will help develop a long range funding strategy for WT. Possible revenue sources include permit fees, fine monies, projects charges en lieu of monitoring, and subscription fees for private sector data management.

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date:

Concept Statement

Cost Savings (describe how cost will be reduced):

The public costs due to the State's inconsistent processes to apply for and track C138wetland permits and not be able to track the performance of its wetland policies, programs, and projects has not been estimated. It is known that the State has spent millions over years trying to compile inconsistent and inadequate data about wetlands. IT recommendations stemming from the most recent report sponsored by the SWRCB on the performance of its 401/WDR program mirror previous recommendations and are largely addressed by WT.

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: _____

Concept Statement

Cost Avoidance (describe the cost and how avoided):

WT development costs will be minimized through a consortium of state and federal IT developers linked to CEDEN and the regional environmental data centers of the SWRCB. The consortium is expected to serve as the web Portal Development Workgroup to the State Water Quality Monitoring Council. This approach is designed to leverage the expertise and existing capacities of many agencies. Ongoing OM costs will be minimized by standardizing the WT content, structure, and engineering based on advice and review from the Wetland Monitoring and Portal Workgroups. The WT utilizes Open Source technology at this time to eliminate software licensing and support fees.


Risk Avoidance (describe the risk and how avoided):

The WT incurs no risks of penalties or fines.

Improved Services:

These have been described above as benefits. To summarize, the WT will improve the efficiency of wetland permitting, enable the State to assess the performance of its wetland protection policies, programs, and projects, and enable the public to access information and the distribution and condition of wetlands. All of this will enable the public to understand the return on its investment in wetlands through State taxes and fees.

Consistency

"No" Responses 		Rationale	Action Required
Enterprise Architecture			
Business Plan			
Strategic Plan			

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date:

Concept Statement

Impact to Other Agencies

Nature of Impact to Other Agencies

Agency:
<i>Describe the nature of the impact:</i>

Agency:
<i>Describe the nature of the impact:</i>

Agency:
<i>Describe the nature of the impact:</i>

Agency:
<i>Describe the nature of the impact:</i>

CA - PMM

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: _____

Concept Statement

Solution Alternatives

Alternative 1:

Technical Considerations for Alternative 1:

ROM Cost:

to

Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range

Alternative 2:

Technical Considerations for Alternative 2:

ROM Cost:

to

Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range

CA - PMM

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: _____

Concept Statement

Alternative 3:

--

Technical Considerations for Alternative 3:

--

ROM Cost:

to

Note: high end of range must not exceed 200% of low end of range

Recommendation

Comparison:

Alternative 1	ROM Cost	Risk
	-	
Alternative 2	ROM Cost	Risk
	-	
Alternative 3	ROM Cost	Risk
	-	

Conclusions:

1	
2	
3	
4	

CA - PMM

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: _____

Concept Statement

Recommendation:

--

Project Approach *(if known)*

System Complexity:		System Business Hours: (e.g., 24x7, 9am-5pm) :			
Architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> Mainframe	<input type="checkbox"/> Client Server	<input type="checkbox"/> Web Based	Num. of New Databases:	1
	X		X		
Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> New	<input type="checkbox"/> New to Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> In-House Experience	Interfaces:	External
	X				
Implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Central Site	<input type="checkbox"/> Phased Roll-out		Num. of Sites:	3+
	X				
M & O Support	<input type="checkbox"/> Contractor	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Center	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Sponsor	
	X		X		
Procurement Approach: (consult with OSI Procurement Center)				Number of Procurements:	
NA Existing system and its further development is internal to state agencies.					
Open Procurement?		Delegated Procurement?			
Scope of Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation <input type="checkbox"/> M & O <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				

CA - PMM

Proposal Name: Wetland Tracker

Proposal Priority #: 3

Department: CalEPA State Water Resources Control Board

Revision Date: ☐ Development

Concept Statement

	X	X	X	
Anticipated Length of Contract:		3 Years /	extensions for	years